

Agenda
Solid Waste Task Force Meeting
January 25, 2005
Group Decision Support Center

7:00 PM WELCOME, TASK FORCE BUSINESS

William Lecos, Chairman

JR Holt, Group Facilitator

7:10 PM ROLES AND GROUND RULES

7:30 PM SWTF DRAFT REPORT AS OF JANUARY 25TH

9:10 PM OTHER ITEMS

Report from collectors

9:20 PM ADJOURN MEETING

Next Meeting: February 22, 2005, Group Decision Support Center

Minutes
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM TASK FORCE
January 25, 2005 7:00 - 10:00 p.m.
Group Decision Support Center, Pennino Building

Attendees: Marilyn Blois, Joyce Doughty, Bill Lecos, Joan Carr, Paul Liberty, Phil Auld, Sheila Roit, John Hasle, Robin Smyers, Conrad Mehan, Clark Tyler

Members Absent: Jim Langemeier, Joann McCoy, Queenie Cox, Joyce Bissonette

Staff: Marilyn McHugh, Jeff Smithberger, Pamela Gratton, Linda Boone

LMI: Dan Jackson

Facilitator: J.R. Holt, JRH Associates, Inc.

Guests: Pat Sanborn, Larry Edwards, Deborah Wisoff, Catherine Lunsford

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:03, when a quorum was present.
The minutes were approved with one change on page 1, last bullet to read "a collector...".

The Chairman explained the process for editing the report, using a formal motion and voting protocol to ensure that all changes were heard and a decision made. Queenie Cox and Joyce Bissonette submitted their comments to the draft prior to the meeting. Task force members considered their individual comments while moving through the report review process.

The Facilitator explained the process for using the outline function in GroupSystems and how the software would allow annotations to be made to the line numbered, draft report. She listed the task force's ground rules for meetings. The following rules will be used in editing the report:

- Roberts Rules of Order as modified will be used to ensure that suggested changes are heard and a decision made.
- Task force members will allow visitors and staff to make comments on the draft report.
- The focus of the review will be on technical content and diction rather than grammar. Once the report is reviewed by the task it will be professionally edited and proof read for consistent format, grammar, and content.
- The report style will comply with Associated Press guidelines (should not capitalize county nor task force). In the chapters, remove the section numbers, such as E-1, E-2 from the title and add in parentheses at the end of the topic title (see comment #18 below).
- Changes in future drafts of the report will be highlighted in yellow to reflect the approved changes (see comment #36 below).
- The lines will be renumbered consecutively as text is deleted or added.
- Deleted text will not show a line through it.

The task force spent the remainder of the meeting considering the draft report.

1. Changed Line 10 in the Executive Summary to add "(SWTF or Task Force)" as short forms of Solid Waste Task Force.

2. Ms. Cox's motion on page 1, line 22 was to change the word "vet" to "discuss". The motion was seconded by Ms. Roit; the vote was unanimous to change the word.

3. Line 28 was clarified to read, "The recommendations that follow are..."

4. Ms. Cox's motion on line 33 was to add the statement, "Certain recommendations may also require further study by the task force and/or changes to Chapter 109, which supports the statement on page 11 that County staff wants to work with the Task Force to determine if changes are needed...". The motion failed for lack of second but the sentence was changed to read, "The SWTF believes that one of its strongest contributions to residential waste collection has been the increased..."

5. Ms. Cox's motion was entered to change line 36 to read "Recommend clarifying how the focus on customer service resulted in improvements. Improvements by the County? By the collection companies?" It failed for lack of a second.

6. The Chairman moved to remove line 36 through "...quality of life" and move both remaining sentences to the paragraph above, changing the last sentence to read, "The operations of collection companies and county staff have been improved through discussions about procurement of services and the clarifications about the county's role in disaster operations and residential waste collection in general." The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

The task force agreed not to expend more energy on the Executive Summary at this point, until the remainder of the report recommendations was finalized.

7. Ms. McHugh moved to change line 81 to read, "The findings and recommendations of the task force are presented to the Board of Supervisors in this report." Mr. Lecos seconded the motion it was approved unanimously.

8. The following names or stakeholder representative titles were changed as a correction:
Line 90, Sheila Roit, Environmental Quality Advisory Council (EQAC)
Line 91, William Lecos, Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce
Line 107, Joan Carr

9. In line 113, delete the word "ways" as an administrative change.

10. Line 118 was administratively changed to end following the Department of Purchasing and Supply Management and an "and" was added before Department.

11. Line 133 Ms. Cox's motion to add "residential" to Line 133 so that it reads, "The task force was charged with resolving residential solid waste collection issues..." was seconded by Ms. Doughty and passed unanimously.

12. Line 151 Ms. Cox motion to replace the word "advocate" with "educate," had a second and was approved in a vote of 1 no and 10 yes.

13. Mr. Lecos moved to change line 172 to read, "County staff conducted a tour of local disposal and recycling facilities for task force members." It was seconded by Ms. Roit and passed unanimously.

14. On line 189, an administrative suggestion was made to delete "three" and change to read "quarterly".

15. Line 217, delete "During the four meetings" and change the sentence to read "The task force utilized GroupSystems software in the Fairfax County Group Decision Support Center and a ...". The change passed as an administrative clarification.

16. Line 222, insert "Input from the GDSC process is included in the minutes in Appendix ____"

17. Ms. Roit moved to format the report by the Associated Press (AP) style guide. Mr. Lecos seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

18. Ms. Doughty moved to universally place the topic numbers at the end of the heading titles and in parentheses. Mr. Lecos seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

19. Mr. Liberty moved that line 247 be changed to read, "A majority of the task force agreed that having competition...." It was seconded by Ms. Doughty. With a friendly amendment, the change was accepted to read, "A majority of the task force members agreed..." and approved unanimously.

20. Mr. Liberty moved to strike lines 264 -266. It was seconded and passed unanimously.

21. Ms. McHugh suggested language for the rewrite of lines 262-268, "A legal review by the County Attorneys Office revealed that the county currently lacks legal authority to purchase fuel for resale to private collection companies or otherwise sell its fuel to a private company. Enabling legislation would be necessary to implement this recommendation. Lacking that approval, the task force recommends that the county explore other options to facilitate the use of alternative fuels by private collection companies." Mr. Lecos moved approval of the language, Ms Smyers seconded, and it passed unanimously.

22. Mr. Lecos moved the deletion of recommendation E-2-2. It was seconded by Ms. Smyers and passed unanimously.

The task force discussed the need to have discussion titles for the discussion sections of each topic. It was decided that discussion titles would remain.

23. Ms. Doughty moved to amend Recommendation E-3-1 to read, "Continue to collect solid waste and recyclables separately as currently done in the county." It was seconded by Ms. Smyers and passed unanimously.

24. Mr. Liberty moved that line 304 be removed that reads, "The processor has suggested that in the future it might not take plastic bagged yard waste at all." Mr. Auld seconded the motion, but it failed to pass on a vote of 4 yes and 6 no and 1 abstaining.

25 Mr. Liberty moved to change line 308 to read, "There are differing opinions...". Mr. Mehan seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

26. Ms. Bissonette's motion was to amend the report to require the use of paper bags with a one-year phase in period. Mr. Lecos seconded the motion but it failed on a vote of 3 yes and 8 no votes.

27. It was suggested that the information that county staff researched about how other jurisdictions collect leaves be included as an appendix to the report.

28. Mr. Liberty moved that the word "already" be deleted from line 311. It was accepted as an administrative change.

29. Mr. Liberty moved that lines 329-333 be deleted. It was seconded by Mr. Lecos and approved unanimously.

30. Ms. Cox moved that line 340 be changed to add language that allows the County to work with the task force. The motion failed for lack of a second.

31. Ms. McHugh moved that line 345-347 be changed to read, "In the past, some homeowners associations (HOAs) with grounds maintenance contracts were granted exemptions from the requirement for separate pick up of yard waste by trash collection companies."

32. Two administrative changes were added to line 348 to read grounds "maintenance" companies and line 349 to read ground "maintenance" contracts.

33. Ms. Bissonette moved that line 352 be changed to add a comment, "Most townhouse associations have virtually no room for composting, many barely have back yards, so composting won't work there very well. Educating and advocating about backyard composting is still a good idea." The motion failed due to lack of a second.

34. It was suggested that part of Ms. Bissonette's motion replace line 352 to read, "Many HOAs are townhome or condominium complexes with small private yards that do not generate much yard waste, many have little or no room for composting, so what yard waste is produced can be disposed easily in the regular trash."

35. Ms. Bissonette moved that line 395 have amended to include "... and encourage other public/private partnerships to recycle e-waste. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lecos and approved unanimously.

36. Following discussion about the definition of e-waste, Ms. Doughty moved to include definitions of acceptable e-waste and recycling opportunities on the county's website. Mr. Lecos seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

The Chairman asked staff to redraft the first part of the report and modify the Executive Summary chart to conform with changes approved tonight. Staff was asked to highlight changes that are made in report so task force members can easily review the report.

A copy of the final report of the discussion captured in GroupSystems is attached.

Hauler Meeting

Notes from the meeting on January 6 were distributed. Conrad and others are still working on the Good Housekeeping Seal for Customer Service or customer service standards. There are some collectors who want to accept the standards and others who do not. Conrad provided the Chairman with a copy.

The Chairman invited collectors to meet at the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce on Wednesday February 9, 2005 at 3:30 p.m. to discuss customer service. Staff will email the invitation to task force members and mail to collectors. The address is 8230 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 350, Vienna, VA.

Other topics

- Robin Smyers informed the members she will not be at the next meeting.
- The March meeting date was changed from March 22 to March 29 to accommodate the spring break schedule for schools.
- The February, March and April task force meetings will be held in the GDSC to facilitate finalizing the report.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE REPORT FROM JANUARY 25TH, 2005, MEETING

Tuesday, January 25, 2005

Agenda - SWMTF Report - Jan 25 2005 Meeting	3
ROLES AND GROUND RULES	4
SWMTF DRAFT REPORT AS OF JANUARY 25TH MEETING	6

Agenda - SWMTF Report - Jan 25 2005 Meeting

1/25/2005

7:00 PM WELCOME, TASK FORCE BUSINESS

William Lecos, Chairman

JR Holt, Group Facilitator

7:10 PM ROLES AND GROUND RULES

7:30 PM SWMTF DRAFT REPORT AS OF JANUARY 25TH

9:10 PM OTHER ITEMS

Report from haulers

9:20 PM ADJOURN MEETING

See you on February 22nd.

ROLES AND GROUND RULES

MEETING PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE

PURPOSE:

- Use collaborative technology to collect and adjudicate comments on the draft Task Force report

SCOPE:

- Executive Summary
- Chapter 1 Introduction
- Chapter 2 Environmental

MEETING OBJECTIVE:

- Approve these sections of the Report

SESSION OUTPUT (edited) will be disseminated as basis of meeting minutes.

PARTICIPANTS & CHAIRMAN - YOU!

CHAIRMAN

- Participate as Task Force member
- Officiate over voting results
- Oversee meeting

PARTICIPANTS

Responsible for CONTENT

PARTICIPATE actively

REPRESENT your IDEAS and your constituents' perspectives as appropriate

YOU JOINTLY OWN THE PRODUCT OF THE MEETING!

FACILITATION TEAM

Responsible for the PROCESS of the meeting (FACILITATES)

Ensures EQUAL PARTICIPATION

Deals with GROUP DYNAMICS

Maintains meeting PACE

Ensures COMPLETION of ACTIVITIES

Is the INTERFACE between the participants and the technology.

STARTS and STOPS participants in the software

CONTROLS the SOFTWARE, gives and takes away participant privileges

Provides all TECHNICAL SUPPORT (hardware, software, network)

GROUND RULES

NEW: Use ROBERTS RULES of Order to work through "annotations"

USE THE TECHNOLOGY to record and/or capture ideas/opinions before we have verbal discussions

CHANGE: The meeting is "NON-ATTRIBUTION / NON-RETRIBUTION." This evening we are asking Task Force Members to identify yourself so that we can keep accurate minutes of motions made and seconded.

Be COURTEOUS

Do not INTERRUPT

Stay FOCUSED on the Task Force interests.

Look beyond the "BOTTOM LINE" to make sure we are achieving what the majority of Task Force members have chosen.

Keep MOVING FORWARD -- Don't wait for the 100% solution.

Don't get your feelings HURT.

CHANGE: Appointed Task Force MEMBERS will input information into the computers anonymously. Other attendees will have their ideas attributed. This evening we are asking Task Force members to identify yourself so that we can keep accurate minutes of motions made and seconded.

If we can't come to consensus at this meeting, we will use the "PARKING LOT" -- but very sparingly.

CONSENSUS

Everyone has INPUT

Have a GENERAL UNDERSTANDING of ideas and discussions

Select the group's PREFERRED course of action

Usually NOT unanimous or complete agreement

ROBERTS RULES OF ORDER: Instructions and practice session

The Six Steps to Every Motion:

STEP 1. A member stands up, is recognized, and makes a motion;

[Each motion is presented as a "yellow sticky" to the draft report.]

[JR Holt: Re Step 1: Move that the member raise his/her hand instead of stand up.]

STEP 2. Another member seconds the motion;

[Holt: I move the member clearly states his/her name when seconding a motion.]

STEP 3. The presiding officer restates the motion to the assembly;

STEP 4. The members discuss the motion;

STEP 5. Presiding officer asks for the affirmative votes & then the negative votes;

STEP 6. The presiding officer announces the result of the voting; instructs the corresponding officer to take action; and introduces the next item of business.

ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Identify yourself when you make a motion using the "yellow sticky"
2. When you make a motion, refer to the line number on the printed Draft Report. You can also refer to the computer paragraph number.
3. When you second a motion, be sure that Linda gets your name for the official minutes.

SWMTF DRAFT REPORT AS OF JANUARY 25TH

Executive Summary

GLOBAL CHANGES:

Comply with county OPA: do not capitalize county nor task force

In the Environmental section, move the E-1, E - 2 from the beginning of the main topics and add them as parentheticals at the end of the topic.

Summary of Task Force's Work

The Solid Waste Task Force (SWTF) was appointed by the Board of Supervisors to work with county staff to review residential waste collection customer service and other issues that arose during the public hearing process for approval of the Solid Waste Management Plan. One of the recommendations of the plan was to have the County be more involved in oversight of residential waste collection. The Board removed that recommendation from the plan and appointed the SWTF "to resolve issues related to service quality, competition, air emissions from trucks, safety, disaster and emergency response, unified recycling activities and other issues that may be specified by the Board of Supervisors."

The SWTF in conjunction with county staff immediately organized their activities and began meeting monthly. The task force identified and categorized the issues and methodically worked through them using available technology to assist in the discussion, consensus building and preparation of this report.

Members of the task force met with waste collection companies to vet the recommendations contained in this report. The proceedings of the task force were available to the community to review on a webpage specifically developed for the task force. Meeting locations, approved minutes, issues, recommendations, information materials, and the draft report have been available on the webpage and publicized to the collection companies and community members since the task force began its work.

PASSED Motion: Queenie Cox: Page 1 Line 22: Third paragraph; first sentence: Recommend either replacing the word "vet" or reword the sentence because it appears that the task force had "advanced" recommendations and no collection companies were a members of the task force.]

Line 22: Change "vet" to "discuss"

The recommendations below are the result of research, dialog among the task force members, discussion with collection companies at their quarterly meetings, input from residents and community groups via email links from the webpage, and other sources who wished to comment. The recommendations in some cases validate work that was already done as part of the Solid Waste Management Plan process. The recommendations are the consensus of the SWTF.

Some recommendations may require additional work on the part of county staff or the collection companies and the SWTF believes that one its strongest contributions to the county has been the increased emphasis or focus on enhancing communications between the companies, the county, and their customers. The focus on customer service has resulted in improvements that may not be glaringly apparent to customers, but will support continued good customer service in the future. The environmental recommendations support continued activities to maintain the county's environment and quality of life. The operations of both collections companies and county staff have been improved through discussions about procurement of services and the clarifications about the county's role in disaster operations and residential waste collection in general.

FAILED:Queenie Cox: Page 2, Line 33: Last paragraph; first sentence: Recommend adding: Certain recommendations may also require further study by the task force and/or changes to Chapter 109, which supports the statement on page 11 that "County staff wants to work with the Task Force to determine if changes are needed..." Also, recommend including communications between the companies and its customers and the companies and the County as strong contributions, which supports one of the objectives.

Queenie Cox: Page 2, Line 36:Last paragraph; second sentence: Recommend clarifying how the focus on customer service resulted in improvements. Improvements by the County? By the collection companies?

PASSED: Motion: Remove line 36 through quality of life. Move both remaining sentences to paragraph above.

Summary of Task Force Recommendations

The following chart summarizes the recommendations of the SWTF contained in this report. The reference refers to the page where a more complete discussion of the issue and recommendations of the task force occur.

Chart: Intentionally blank

Signature Block:

William Lecos, Chairman

Joann McCoy, Vice-chairman

Table of Contents: Intentionally Blank

Comments on Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction

Background

The Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ) promulgated regulations in 2001 that required all jurisdictions to prepare and submit a solid waste management plan to the state by July 1, 2004. These plans describe how the jurisdictions' solid waste management system will operate during the next 20 years and encompass all source reduction, reuse, recycling, collection, transportation and disposal activities within the jurisdiction, both public and private.

In Fairfax County, this comprehensive plan was developed over an 18-month period and contained input from stakeholders, residents, businesses, and county staff. An extensive community outreach program gathered information about relevant topics via an online survey, attendance at hundreds of community meetings, formal public meetings and culminated in a public hearing before the County's Board of Supervisors on May 10, 2004. Most of the recommendations in the plan were approved at the public hearing. One recommendation - that the county become more involved in oversight and control of residential waste collection-- spurred community discussion of collection services. Following the many comments about the need for further study of residential collection issues, the Board of Supervisors decided to remove the recommendation from the plan and create the Solid Waste Task Force (SWTF). The Task Force was to study the customer service and operational issues in more detail. With this change made, the plan was submitted to VDEQ in June 2004.

The SWTF began its meetings in June 2004 and completed its report in April 2005. The report findings and recommendations will be presented to the Board of Supervisors in May 2005.

PASSED: Motion: Change last sentence: "are presented to the BOS in this report."

Members

The Solid Waste Task Force was established by the Board of Supervisors as part of the public hearing process on May 10, 2004. On May 24, 2004, the Board of Supervisors appointed the following 16 members to the Task Force as representatives of various stakeholders in the residential waste collection system:

Name	Stakeholder Representative
Sheila Roit	Environmental Quality Advisory Committee (EQAC)
William Lecos	Chamber of Commerce
Joyce Bissonette	Small Business Commission
Marilyn S. Blois	Consumer Protection Commission
Paul J. Liberty	Subscription Customer
Robin Smyers	Contract Customer (e.g., Homeowners' Association)
Queenie Cox	Sanitary District Customer
Jim Langemeier	Recycling Market

John Hasle	Small Solid Waste Collection Company (less than 10 rear-loading packers)
Joanne McCoy	Small Solid Waste Collection Company
Conrad Mehan	Medium Solid Waste Collection Company (10 to 50 rear-loading packers)
Peter Crane	Large Solid Waste Collection Company (over 50 rear-loading packers)
Joyce Doughty	Solid Waste Management Program Staff Representative
Clark Tyler	Community representative
Joann Carr	Community representative
John Townes	Community representative

CHANGES: Line 90: Council

Line 91: Fairfax County CoC

Line 107: Joan

Phil Auld replaced Peter Crane as a member in December 2004. John Townes resigned from the Task force in November 2004 and was not replaced.

County staff assisted the SWTF ways during its deliberations. Jeff Smithberger, Director of Division of Solid Waste Collection and Recycling, was the principal County staff member, assisted by Linda Boone, Branch Chief, Planning and Resource Recovery. Additional staffing came from employees of the Solid Waste Management Program, the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, the County Attorney's Office, the Department of Information Technology, the Department of Purchasing and Supply Management, the Health Department, the Department of Planning and Zoning, the Police Department, and the Department of Cable Communications and Consumer Protection.

Logistics Management Institute (LMI), a non profit consulting firm, worked periodically with the task force. Dan Jackson was the project lead, based upon his prior involvement with the development of the Solid Waste Management Plan, and Colin Waitt and Audrey Borja served as facilitators.

Activities using GroupSystems software and the Group Decision Support Center were facilitated by JR Holt of JRH Associates, Inc., an Alexandria company.

William Lecos was selected by the members to be the chairman of the SWTF and Joann McCoy assisted as the vice chairman.

Purpose

The task force was established by the Board of Supervisors for a period of one year. The task force was charged with resolving solid waste collection issues related to service quality, competition, air emissions from trucks, safety, disaster and emergency response, unified recycling activities, and other issues as specified by the Board of Supervisors.

PASSED: Queenie Cox: Page 8, Line 133: Second sentence: Recommend inserting "residential" so that the sentence reads: "The task force was charged with resolving residential solid waste collection issues..." The insertion would make clear that the task force did not address solid waste collection issues associated with businesses.

Objectives

The objectives identified during the initial task force meeting on June 8, 2004 were:

- * To resolve residential waste collection issues categorized into environmental, customer service and operations matters; and,
- * To prepare a report to the Board of Supervisors within one year (May 2005).

During the September 28, 2004 meeting, these objectives were reconfirmed and additional objectives were added to focus the work of the task force:

- * To enhance relationships between collection companies and the county by improving communications.

- * To ensure local communities are kept abreast of and involved in the task force process;
- * To ensure that the small business point of view is represented;
- * To identify mutually beneficial resolution of issues;
- * To advocate for expansion of all types of recycling;

PASSED with 1 objection: Queenie Cox: Page 9, Line 151: 7th bullet: Recommend replacing the word "advocate" with "educate." The task force should not be advocating anything.

- * To ensure that issues are resolved in the best interest of the community; and,
- * To reach viable consensus on issues with consideration of a broad perspective of ideas.

Webpage.

Webpage

In early June 2004, a webpage was developed to encourage community involvement and participation by individuals and other waste collection companies who were not members of the task force. The webpage is located at www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/swtf and contains the dates of meetings of the task force, approved minutes of the meetings, information distributed to the task force, list of task force members, collection company meeting dates and notes of the meetings, timeline for the task force's work, the draft report, and other relevant information. The webpage was continually updated with information about the status of the task force.

An important feature on the webpage was an interactive way to contact the task force and provide input or address questions to the task force. The intent was that community members would use the webpage to remain informed about what the task force was doing and to provide feedback to the task force's work. Some community members attended the task force meetings as a result of information contained on the webpage.

Tour of facilities

County staff offered to arrange a tour of local disposal and recycling facilities if task force members were interested. The purpose of the tour was to familiarize SWTF members with various sites that are not routinely open to the public as well as provide opportunities to research issues for the environmental topics that are part of the charter of the task force. On September 1, 2004, task force members toured seven local disposal and recycling facilities. The facilities were a mix of county-owned and private operations, and included the following locations:

PASSED: Line 172: Motion: County staff conducted a tour of local disposal and recycling facilities for the task force members.

- * Loudoun Composting, LLC
- * Capitol Fiber, Inc.
- * Newington-County collection office
- * Lorton Construction/Demolition/Debris Landfill
- * I-95 Complex
- * I-66 Transfer Station

Details and information about each of the sites is located in Appendix ____.

Meetings with Collection Companies

Task Force members attended three county-sponsored quarterly meetings with the waste collection companies to learn firsthand their viewpoints on the issues. During these meetings, task force members listened, asked questions, and tried to understand the solid waste collection business in Fairfax County.

PASSED: LINE 189: NOTE: This paragraph will be updated as meetings continue. Delete the number "three" and "quarterly."

County staff also encouraged the collection companies to be involved in the deliberations of the SWTF and several companies attended the monthly meetings. The attendees offered ideas and suggestions that were considered in developing the recommendations.

Process for completing the issue review

The issues surrounding residential waste collection are complex and the perspectives of the task force members are diverse. For this reason, the county engaged Logistics Management Institute (LMI) of Tysons Corner to facilitate the work of the Task Force. LMI had experience in local solid waste issues due to its participation in the development of the Solid Waste Management Plan.

The LMI facilitators assisted the task force and county staff to identify and list all the issues from the development of the Solid Waste Management Plan, the public meetings, the public hearing, the Board of Supervisors, and other sources. The task force then agreed to organize the issues into 3 categories: environmental, customer service and operations issues. Similar issues were consolidated, defined, discussed and then prioritized within the categories. The list of categorized issues forms the framework for the remainder of this report.

The task force members researched information about each topic, investigated how their stakeholders felt about the issue, participated in discussions about the issue, and weighed the impact on the community of any recommendations. Finally, each issue was assessed in terms of any recommendations the task force would like to make to the Board of Supervisors. Full and complete discussion of each issue resulted in members being apprised of the implications of recommendations such as cost, difficulty to implement within the county or by the collection companies, and impacts of the residential waste collection service changes to residents or customers.

During four meetings, the task force employed GroupSystems software and a facilitator/technographer. This technology allowed the task force to capture all ideas, define nuances of issues, vote on items, and craft consensus-based recommendations during discussions of more complex and controversial customer service and operations issues. The use of the county's Group Decision Support Center and consultant enabled the task force to aggressively proceed with reviewing issues and determining its recommendations.

PASSED: Line 217: Delete "During the four meetings" to "The task force utilized GroupSystems software in the Fairfax County Group Decision Support Center and a ..."

PASSED: Line 222 Insert: "Input from the GDS process is included in Appendix

The following chapters summarize the research and discussions of the task force. Chapters dealing with environmental, customer service, and operational issues are divided into lettered and numbered issue areas, e.g. E-1 for environmental issue 1. Within each issue is a description of the process used by the task force to do its work. Each issue contains a numbered recommendation (e.g. E-1-1) based upon the consensus of the members. In some instances, the recommendation is to continue with the direction already offered by the Solid Waste Management Plan. This additional review and consideration provided further validity to the strategies contained in the Solid Waste Management Plan.

Chapter 2 Environmental

Overview of environmental issues in the County

Sheila Roit, in her role as Environmental Quality Advisory Council (EQAC) representative, provided background information about the status of Fairfax County's environment. She offered history about the Clean Air Act of 1990 and its implications for the county as well as the potential impact on the county of pending federal legislation. She supplied the task force with recent reports from the county's Environmental Coordinating Committee's Air Quality Subcommittee, located online at <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/opa/airquality/cleanairmenu.pdf>. She also shared comments from the EQAC report discussing water quality, noise, hazardous materials, light, and other general environmental issues in the county, available online at <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/eqac/report/>.

With this context in place, the Task Force discussed the environmental issues concerning residential waste collection.

GLOBAL CHANGE: Line 242: task force. Format in accordance with County OPA.

E-1 and E-2 Air emissions from trucks and use of special fuels

Discussion. The discussion involved the possible consolidated collections of materials in order to reduce collection truck traffic on community streets, and the use of less-polluting fuels for collection vehicles. The collectors and some of the other task force members thought that having competition among collectors was important and that the very nature of competition necessitated multiple trucks on streets. The County code requires separate collection of waste and recycling materials, which also results in additional collection trucks on streets; however, collectors can choose to collect waste and recyclables in the same vehicle and still meet County Code requirements, as long as the materials are kept separated.

PASSED: Line 244: Move (E-1 & E-2) to end of topic

PASSED: Motion: Paul Liberty Line 247

Remove "The collectors and some of the," Upper case "T" in task, Remove "other," Replace "thought" with ?

Replace: line 247: "A majority of the task force agreed that having competition...."

The SWTF members unanimously endorsed other environmental initiatives designed to reduce truck emissions such as exploration of alternative fuels and fuel additives.

County staff agreed to explore county-sponsored fuel sites, accessible by the private waste collection vehicles, to make ultra-low sulfur fuels reliably available. Private waste collection companies would pay for the fuel but might realize a cost savings due the county's ability to purchase the special fuels in bulk quantities.

Since Virginia is a Dillon Rule state, the county may not be able to sell fuel without getting express permission from the State Assembly. If approved, County staff would develop guidelines to make the access/affordability of low emissions fuel easier for private collection companies. The Chamber of Commerce could help with enabling legislation, if needed, to allow the county to supply the private collection companies with special fuels.

NOTE: Legally, private companies cannot use 'county' fuel sites; however, the county government may be able to facilitate the location of a private fueling site for these special fuels.

FAILED: Paul Liberty Line 264 Strike sentence

PASSED: Change lines 262 through 268 as follows

"A legal review by the County Attorneys Office revealed that the County currently lacks legal authority to purchase fuel for resale to private collection companies or otherwise sell its fuel to a private company. Enabling legislation would be necessary to implement this recommendation. Alternatively, the task force recommends that the County facilitate the location of an alternative source for these special fuels."

PASSED: Motion: Strike line 264 - , "The Chamber.....fuels"

MOTION: Change line 262: See Marilyn's stickie: "A legal review..... #240

Lacking that approval, the task force recommends the county government explore other options to facilitate

E-1 and E-2 Recommendations

E-1-1. County staff will continue to track the development of alternative fuels and make the results of their research available to residential waste collection companies for their consideration.

E-2-1. County staff and collection companies will continue to explore fuel additives to reduce emissions from waste collection vehicles.

E-2-3. County staff will explore allowing private waste collection vehicles to use County refueling sites to purchase lower emissions fuels. When the fuel is available, county staff will develop guidelines to make the access/affordability of low emission fuel easier for private collection companies.

PASSED: Auld- need to strike E-2-3 due to legal requirements.

E-3 Collection and recycling of materials

Discussion. The collection of solid waste is a health and safety requirement as well as a quality-of-life feature. The issue of whether waste and recyclable materials such as yard waste could be collected in the same vehicle was further described and debated. The discussion centered on whether there was a need to collect yard waste separately at all. The sense of the SWTF was that the current system of separate collections is needed in order to maintain the State-mandated recycling rate and to extend the capacity of the Energy/Resource Recovery Facility to process solid waste in the future.

E-3 Recommendations

E-3-1. Continue to collect solid waste and recyclables as currently done in the county.

PASSED: Line 289: Doughty: alter language to allow for expansion of recycling program..

Change Line 289 to read: "Continue to collect solid waste and recyclables separately as currently done in the county."

E-3-2. Continue to collect yard waste separately per Chapter 109 of the Fairfax County Code.

E-4 Plastic versus paper bags for collection of yard waste and leaves

Discussion. The pros and cons of plastic versus paper bags for collection of yard waste were discussed from the perspective of collection companies, the yard waste processor, and residents. Generally, collection companies did not favor one method over the other, but agreed that paper bags are strong and would reduce confusion about whether a plastic bag contains trash or yard waste. They saw a possible benefit of being able to print customer information on paper bags.

From the yard waste composting perspective, paper bags are preferable since about 25% of the yard waste currently collected in plastic bags cannot be recycled because the plastic bags get caught in the debagging machinery and have to be disposed in a landfill. A major local composting facility has asked the county's Business Advisory Committee on Solid Waste to recommend the use of paper kraft bags for collection of yard waste. The processor has suggested that in the future it might not take plastic bagged yard waste at all. In the future, local processors may not be available to recycle yard waste in plastic bags, since the trend is toward using paper bags for collection of yard waste.

FAILED: Paul Liberty

Begins at line 304, remove sentence beginning "The processor" and the next sentence beginning "In the future" Anecdotal comments, since no formal documents were provided to task force

Residents have differing opinions about using paper bags since the bags may not be as readily available, cost more in comparison to plastic bags, are heavy and unhandy to fill, and would remove choice from the residents. Several neighboring jurisdictions -- City of Fairfax, City of Falls Church, Town of Herndon, and Loudoun County -- already require paper bags for yard waste collection, and Arlington County is proposing to mandate paper bags. These jurisdictions are the county's major competitors for access to the limited yard waste recycling capacity in the region.

FAILED: Joyce Bissonette: E-4 - I still feel that we should recommend that paper be used, with a one year acclimation period so that people can get in the habit. They ARE going to have to change one of these days, even though they don't like it. This is going to be necessary so they can start now. We can't be short-sighted - this is a 20 year plan. The stores such as Home Depot, etc. will stock up on inventory when they know bags are required, and then the cost will come down.

PASSED

Paul Liberty Line 308 Replace "residents" with "There are"

Paul Liberty Line 311 Remove the word "already"

LINE 308: "There are differing opinions...."

LINE 311: "... and Loudoun County -- require paper bags for"

There are environmental benefits to using paper, but some task force members expressed concern that residents would balk at the proposition of banning plastic bags. Given the disparity of opinions about the

value of paper versus plastic bags, County staff was asked to research the implementation of paper bag collection in other jurisdictions and provide additional information to the task force.

ADD: A reference to the task force meeting minutes which can be found in the Appendix.

Staff reported that the reason that many programs around the country began composting yard waste was because their states or jurisdictions banned yard waste from landfills. Many composting facilities want to ban plastic bags. As noted above, some jurisdictions in the area have already banned plastic bags for the collection of yard waste.

When these local programs implemented paper bags, there were mixed reactions from customers. The amount of rejected material at the composting facility was reduced with paper bags. Most local jurisdictions that banned plastic bags for yard waste did so many years ago.

County staff wants to work with the Task Force to determine if changes are needed in the way recyclables are collected. Almost 90% of the yard waste composted at Loudoun Composting is currently from Fairfax County. If recycling of yard waste continues to increase, and if neighboring jurisdictions continue to move to paper bags, Fairfax County may be forced to change to paper bags or not be able to dispose of its yard waste at this compost site.

PASSED:

Paul Liberty Line 331

Remove paragraph beginning Line 329: "If recycling"

E-4 Recommendations

E-4-1. County should develop an education campaign directed to encourage citizens to voluntarily use paper bags for yard waste so that more of the material can be recycled.

E-4-2. County staff should continue to evaluate if more stringent restrictions are needed about how yard waste is collected in the years to come.

FAILED: Queenie Cox: Page 18, Line 340: E-4 Plastic versus paper bags for collection of yard waste and leaves Recommendation E-4-2: Suggest language that allows the County to work with the task force be included.

E-5 Separate collection of yard waste within HOAs that have grounds maintenance contracts

Discussion. In the past, some homeowners associations (HOAs) with grounds maintenance contracts were granted exemptions so that their trash collection companies were exempt from providing a separate pickup of yard waste. This was based on the presumption that the grounds companies were disposing of most of the yard waste as part of their contracts. The task force discussion varied about the need to continue with the exemption to HOAs with grounds contracts. The exemption allows the trash contractor to also accept "minimal amounts" of yard waste from homeowners in the regular trash. Many HOAs are townhome or condominium complexes with small private yards that do not generate much yard waste, so what is produced can be disposed easily in the regular trash. A collection company representative has asked the County to determine what amount of this type of yard waste is permitted to be put in with trash. There was no decision about the amount of allowable yard waste, at this time.

FAILED Joyce Bissonette: - E-5 -Just a comment that most townhouse HOA's have virtually no room for composting - many barely have back yards - so composting won't work there very well. But educating and advocating is still a good idea.

PASSED. MOTION: Marilyn

Line 345: "... were granted exemptions from the requirement for separate pick up of yard waste. by trash collection companies. (strike the rest)

Line 349: Add "... grounds maintenance contracts.

Line 348: Add " ... grounds maintenance companies.

PASSED: Add in middle of 352: ...yard waste, others have little room or no room for compsting, so what is produced....

The SWTF members want to continue with the current system and encourage homeowners in these HOAs to process their yard waste on site or within the community. The County could provide educational materials to collection companies for dissemination to their customers about grasscycling, backyard composting, and other topics. The County has periodic sales of backyard composters that could be used within HOAs, if the communities are interested.

E-5 Recommendations

E-5-1. Continue the existing exemption on a site specific basis that allows small amounts of yard waste to be disposed in the regular trash when there is a general ground maintenance contract in place with an HOA.

E-5-2. For HOAs with the exemption, private collection companies should continue to decide how much homeowner yard waste is acceptable as part of the regular trash service.

E-5-3. Encourage HOAs to process their homeowner yard waste on site and encourage landscape firms to process this portion of the waste stream.

E-5-4. County will provide educational materials to collection companies for dissemination to their customers about backyard recycling or community composting.

E-5-5. County will provide periodic sales of backyard composters.

E-6 Electronic waste (e-waste)

Discussion. Currently, the County holds community events to collect computer monitors and other equipment. Some jurisdictions across the United States have banned disposal of e-waste in landfills or incinerators. Currently, the processing of e-waste in the county's Energy/Resource Recovery Facility is a safe alternative; however, as projections show the amount of e-waste continuing to increase yearly, the county needs a policy about disposing of e-waste. The County's Recycling Drop Off Centers are not staffed and so routine collection of e-waste at these sites would be problematic.

The County currently contracts with ServiceSource, a nonprofit agency, to attend the community e-waste recycling events. ServiceSource employees help collect the monitors and electronics, collect fees from customers, and provide tax donation documentation. They transport the electronics to their workshop in Alexandria, where workers dismantle and dispose of the e-waste. In the future, a single agency or company may not be able to handle all the e-waste generated in the County. The sense of the SWTF was that the current system of periodic events is working to remove enough e-waste from the waste stream at this time. Further public outreach efforts should be directed toward encouraging residents to recycle their computers at these events. Additional information about e-waste recycling should be added to the County's website. Banning disposal of e-waste may be needed in the future, but not at this time.

E-6 Recommendations

E-6-1. Continue with the current system of periodic community events to collect e-waste and remove it from the waste stream.

E-6-2. Add information about e-waste recycling to the County's webpage.

PASSED

Motion: Joyce Bissonette: - On e-waste I think we need to strongly encourage public/private partnerships to recycle e-waste and batteries. As noted in the Post article this past week e-waste is a serious and quickly-growing problem.

Line 395: Add "... and encourage other public/private partnerships to recycle e-waste."

PASSED --

Motion: Sheila.

Line 397: "... recycling, including a list of e-waste recycling opportunities, to the County's..."

E-7 Removing Nickel Cadmium (NiCad) batteries from the waste stream

Discussion. The task force discussed various ways to effectively remove NiCad and other rechargeable batteries from the waste stream. The task force specifically examined three alternatives: curbside collection, collection at the two county solid waste complexes at I-66 and I-95, and partnership with the Rechargeable Battery Recycling Corporation (RBRC). The curbside collection alternative was too expensive to implement. Collection at the solid waste complexes was not especially convenient for residents, since most people would not travel to a facility just to dispose of a small battery.

Partnering with RBRC was viewed as the most viable and low cost alternative since virtually the only cost is county staff time. RBRC already has promotional materials and collection points identified through agreements with companies such as Radio Shack, WalMart, Target, Best Buy and other retailers where new batteries are sold. The RBRC covers the shipping, processing and disposal costs. With the county publicizing this program, residents will learn of the availability and need for recycling rechargeable batteries.

The SWTF wants to continue to implement the strategies identified in the Solid Waste Management Plan to remove NiCad batteries from the waste stream. Collection companies, retailers and the media can help disseminate information about the battery recycling program. Support from the county's General Fund will be needed to support this activity.

E-7 Recommendations

E-7-1. The County will expand its partnership with the Rechargeable Battery Recycling Corporation to publicize their existing program for accepting NiCad and rechargeable batteries at retailers for further recycling and removal from the waste stream.

E-7-2. Collection companies, the County, and retailers can help disseminate information about the program to their customers through coordinated public outreach messages.